

able. Since we discussed this last, things have only gotten worse. Unemployment has risen, and Federal agencies have had to make further cuts in personnel. In June 1971, when the Foreign Relations Committee last had hearings on this matter, we received data that there were then 50,000 eligible persons on the Civil Service Register, including thousands with advanced degrees. The State Department added that 9,700 persons had applied to take the Foreign Service examination the previous December for a total of 100 to 200 appointments in the Foreign Service. There is a vast oversupply of people who want to have a glamorous foreign affairs career. Quite clearly, we do not need to spend scarce Government funds to attract people to this field of endeavor.

The program is undesirable in its effect on open competition for Federal employment, giving an elite group an edge on prestigious positions. This is bad public policy.

The program is uneconomical because it would pay the bills of students who would otherwise be financing their own education in this field. Its total cost is completely out of line with our other priorities. By 1965 it is estimated to cost the taxpayer \$60 million a year according to its own sponsor. That is far more than we spend on existing educational exchanges with some 50 foreign countries.

The program is untimely since our limited resources are more urgently needed elsewhere. With all of our financial problems and the concern over budget deficits and the strength of the dollar, I find it almost inconceivable that we should take seriously this additional program.

Finally, I said in August, the program is unrealistic. It would saddle busy Congressmen and Senators and agency heads with the nomination of students and administration and supervision of the program. The students' obligations to the Government are not spelled out and much else is left to be decided in some future regulations to be issued by these busy people. The program has been compared to a type of diplomatic ROTC and considering the problems ROTC has been having, are we sure we want to set up another one? And if a diplomatic ROTC then why not an agriculture ROTC, a science ROTC, and so on down the list?

As I mentioned, these arguments have only gained weight with time. I find it unrealistic that we should be asked to launch an expensive and unnecessary program at this time when we cannot provide adequate funding of existing programs. In fact, more than token appropriations for any of the other programs covered by S. 659 will be difficult to obtain and I do not see why we should further endanger their prospects by taking on a Foreign Service scholarship program.

I repeat what I stated last year—that this program under its different guise is one that the Foreign Relations Committee has studied from time to time beginning with its original form of a Freedom Academy designed to train people in cold war tactics. If this could not be justified

in the past, it surely cannot be justified now.

As an example of where we might find ourselves going with this program, I call attention to an article in the Nation of October 4, 1971, entitled "The Cold War College: Degrees in Paranoia," and ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit T.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The article discusses the Freedom Studies Center at Boston, Va., which likes to be called the "cold war West Point." It was established by private funds after the Congress' failure to enact the freedom academy bill. It has big plans for the future, however, which would require \$11 million for realization, "part of which the Center's organizers hope will come from the Federal Government, with the help of the Congressmen on their advisory board." The article raises questions on the wisdom of putting public funds into the Center and on other principles—

Some might question the propriety of federal and state government officials receiving indoctrination on internal subversion from lecturers who imply that liberal Senators are Communists. Some might question the role of the public school officials who serve on the advisory board of an "educational" institution which claims many college professors are "Communist dupes." Some might question the tax-exempt status of an institution so aggressively devoted to political propaganda. Some might even question the need for a school of cold-war psycho-political warfare.

We all should question this. What we need is to rid ourselves of the cold war mentality and not to perpetuate it.

I think it particularly appropriate to mention that in view of the President's trip to China—of which I approve, and I applaud his efforts. I think they were good ones, in the right direction. To institute a program now which, originally at least, was intended to approach the cold war in a much more aggressive manner seems to me to be inconsistent with what the President has in mind.

I hope the Senate will take seriously the significance of this program. If it should be instituted at this time, I think it would burden us not only with an enormous amount of money, as it is a very large program, as its terms provide, but also it would raise serious doubts about the sincerity of what I believe to be a new attitude, a new policy, on the part of this administration—a new attitude of which I approve and of which I believe the majority of the people in this country approve.

So I hope that the Senate will adopt my amendment, which simply strikes this program from the bill.

As mentioned in the one-page summary which I have had placed on the desk of each Senator, there already is ample opportunity for the training of people, with the orientation and language training that is now authorized in the Foreign Service Act and which is now being provided to employees of some 30 Government agencies. The State Department, in its Foreign Service Institute,

teaches many subjects for the Foreign Service.

In summary, I might say that the theory always has been—and I think it is still a proper one—that men and women who enter the Foreign Service should have the typical broad liberal arts training in history and the humanities which our great universities furnish; and that is the proper background for a Foreign Service officer, in contrast to the much more specialized activity of a soldier, for example. In the academies they do have some liberal arts courses, but they specialize at an earlier age for a highly specialized profession. The profession of Foreign Service officer seems to me of quite a different character, because their responsibility is to interpret our own country to foreigners and to be able, through their knowledge of broad subjects, to understand foreign countries. When it comes to the specialties, that is provided for already in the language courses, if they do not take them in their undergraduate work, although all our colleges of any consequence are quite adequately prepared to offer courses in the languages that are necessary.

I might add that several of our leading universities have schools for Foreign Service officers—that is, they offer, in addition to the regular academic program, the same type of training which is contemplated by this scholarship program.

So what we have here is the institution of an entirely new program, with its own board of trustees of, I believe, nine persons. Then, as bait to the Senators and others, it puts upon us and Representatives and various other officials in the Government the opportunity to nominate people. This bill deals in quite large numbers. I read from page 740:

Not more than 3,500 students may be admitted under section 1205 as new members of the program in any academic year for the purpose of pursuing courses of study leading to an undergraduate degree, and not more than 1,500 students may be admitted under section 1205 as new members of the program in any academic year for the purpose of pursuing courses of study leading to a graduate degree.

Under these scholarships, 5,000 students will be given the opportunity to take courses which are already available to them.

Also, there is the implication, which I think is very important, that, having been nominated under this scholarship program, a feeling of elitism would grow, that they would be given preference over anyone else who may apply for these positions who did not have the benefit of a scholarship—in other words, the graduates of our established institutions who are now the applicants and the people in the Foreign Service at present. There are now 9,700 applicants, as reported by the State Department, for only 100 or 200 places a year.

I think it is most untimely and is contrary in spirit to the present policy of our Government, which is not to specialize in the pursuance of the cold war but to try to bring about a change in the attitude of the people of the various countries who, during the past 25 years, have